

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 14-18 and 20-26 are currently pending, wherein claims 1 and 14 have been amended, new claims 23-26 have been added, claims 6 and 19 have been canceled, and claims 4, 5, 17 and 18 have been withdrawn from consideration. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks presented herein below.

At the outset, Applicants would like to thank Examiner Khatib for the courtesy given Applicants Representative during the telephone interview conducted on September 16, 2010 and the personal interview conducted on October 6, 2010. During the Interviews, Applicants requested the Examiner to confirm whether the indication of receipt of the priority document(s) in the Notice of Acceptance mailed on October 6, 2008 was erroneous. In addition, Applicants asked the Examiner to clarify his rejection of claims 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. first and second paragraphs. More specifically, Applicants' Representative pointed out that the term "intersection" as utilized in the Applicants' Specification refers to the junction or place where two roads meet or cross, without any limitation as to the geometry or function of the junction (i.e., the term intersection includes an exit, an entrance, an L shaped junction, T shaped junction, etc.). Therefore, the Specification provides adequate written description for the phrase "connecting road" as utilized in claims 14-22. The Examiner further clarified his interpretation of the term "connecting". Applicants agreed to amended claim 14 as indicated above, in order further clarify the claimed invention.

In paragraph 6 of the Office action ("Action"), the Examiner states that "applicant has not filed a certified copy of the JP 2004-265352 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b)." As discussed in Applicants previous replies, the Notice of Acceptance of Application under 35 USC §371 has acknowledged receipt of the Japanese priority document. However, it appears that the Office has no record of the certified copy. Accordingly, Applicants will file under separate copy a certified copy of the priority document.

In paragraph 7 of the Action, the Examiner objects to claim 6 because of an informality. Claim 6 has been canceled, rendering this objection moot.

In paragraph 9 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that "the 'connecting road name outputting unit' and 'connecting road

selecting unit' are not supported in the specification" because although an intersection is a connecting road, a connecting road is not necessarily an intersection. Applicants respectfully disagree; however, as agreed, Applicants have amended claim 14 to even further clarify the term connecting road, thereby addressing the Examiner's concerns.

In paragraph 11 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the term "connecting road" is unclear since it "could mean exit, an entrance, a T shape road, a L shape road, a shortcut, etc." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It appears from the Examiner's statements that he is improperly interpreting breadth to be indefiniteness. As clearly stated in § 2173.04 of the MPEP "[b]readth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness. *In re Miller*, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971). The mere fact that a connecting road can include an exit, an entrance, a T shaped crossing, and/or an L shaped cross does not render claims 14-22 indefinite. The claimed invention is directed to a car navigation apparatus configured to search facilities in the vicinity of a connecting road which exists on a route, regardless of the geometric formation (i.e., L or T shaped) or the function (i.e., entrance or exit) of the connection. Although the term "connecting road" may be generic to multiple connections (i.e., T shaped, L shaped, + shaped, exists, entrances, etc.) it is not indefinite. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended claim 14 to even further clarify the term connecting road, thereby addressing the Examiner's concerns. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 13 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 6-9, 14-16, and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0195700 A1 to Hamada ("Hamada"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is well established that in order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 1-3, 6-9, 14-16, and 19-22 are patentable over Hamada because Hamada fails to disclose each and every claimed element. For example, Hamada fails to disclose a display unit configured to display, in order of the route, some of the intersection names, which are outputted by the intersection name outputting unit, on a part of a screen and display a map for route guidance on an another part of the screen as recited in claims 1-3 and 6-9 or a display unit configured to display, in order of the

route, some of the connecting road names, which are outputted by the connect road name outputting unit, on a part of a screen and display a map for route guidance on an another part of the screen as recited in claims 14-16 and 19-22. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Penny Caudle Reg. No. 46,607 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: October 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Penny Caudle #46,607  
D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000